

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 24

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte JAMES S. PRATER and KEVIN G. CHRISTIAN

Appeal No. 2000-0720
Application No. 08/648,849

ON BRIEF

Before URYNOWICZ, DIXON, and BLANKENSHIP, Administrative Patent Judges.

URYNOWICZ, Administrative Patent Judge.

Decision on Appeal

This appeal is from the final rejection of claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-17, 19, 24 and 25. Claims 20-23 are allowed.

The invention pertains to data processing apparatus.
Claim 1 is illustrative and reads as follows:

Appeal No. 2000-0720
Application No. 08/648,849

1. An apparatus for processing data signals comprising:

a first filter means for adjusting an input signal received by the first filter means;

a summing means for summing signals from the first filter means and from a second filter means to produce a summed signal;

a symbol detection means for generating an output signal from the summed signal;

the second filter means for adjusting the output signal; and

a control means for controlling filtering properties of the first filter means and the second filter means, wherein the control means controls filtering properties of the first filter means based on previous data patterns in the input signal received by first filter means.

The references relied upon by the examiner are:

| | | |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| Fisher et al. (Fisher) | 5,132,988 | Jul. 21, 1992 |
| Kim | 5,654,765 | Aug. 05, 1997 |
| | | (filed Nov. 18, 1994) |

Claim 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fisher.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-17, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim.

The respective positions of the examiner and the appellants with regard to the propriety of these rejections

Appeal No. 2000-0720
Application No. 08/648,849

are set forth in the final rejection and the examiner's answer (Paper Nos. 8 and 15, respectively) and the appellants' brief and reply brief (Paper Nos. 13 and 16, respectively).

Appellants' Invention

A summary of the invention is provided at page 7 of the brief.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claim 19

We will not sustain this rejection.

Appellants argue that when data is filtered, Fisher provides no teaching or suggestion to select a set of coefficients from a plurality of sets of coefficients based on previous data patterns transmitted through the equalizer.

We agree. With respect to Figure 2 of Fisher, which is relied on by the examiner, it is clear that filter unit 36 receives equalizer coefficients W for decreasing data error rates of data output signals from memory. However, Fisher has not been shown by the examiner to involve the selection of a set of coefficients from a plurality of sets of coefficients. The examiner relied on Fisher's specification at column 7, lines 10-16 and 34-44, to meet the claim language "selecting a

set of coefficients within the number of sets of coefficients..." but there is nothing in these portions of the specification disclosing a number of sets of coefficients or selecting a set of coefficients within the number of sets of coefficients.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Independent Claims 1, 11 and 24

We will sustain the rejection of claims 1 and 11; we will not sustain the rejection of claim 24.

Kim relates to a channel equalizer for a digital television receiver. With respect to Figures 4 and 6, Kim teaches using an error signal **mk** from error detector 8 to adjust a coefficient for a channel and then stores the coefficient. The coefficient is then used when the channel is selected.

Appellants argue that updating a coefficient using an error signal and the selection of a coefficient based on a channel is not the same as controlling filtering properties based on previous data patterns (claim 1) or controlling filter units based on digital data output from a symbol detector compared to data patterns output by the symbol

detector in response to data signals previously received
(claim 11).

We are not persuaded by these arguments. With respect to Kim's Figures 4 and 6, the coefficients in Kim memory 13 are from data patterns output by slicer (symbol detector) 7. The coefficients correspond to all channels of a digital TV receiver (column 5, lines 34-36). As such, each coefficient of a channel must be a function of the particular characteristics of a channel in order to correct for those characteristics and would be determined utilizing previous data patterns. This is supported by Kim's disclosure at column 1, lines 6-14, wherein it is disclosed that "... a filtering coefficient converging on an optimum value is obtained for a firstly selected channel when an input signal of the firstly selected channel is filtered, the obtained filtering coefficient is stored and the stored filtering coefficient is used as an initial coefficient for filtering the input signal when the firstly selected channel is again selected" (emphasis added). A separate coefficient is obtained for each channel 2-n in this manner.

A further teaching that coefficients in memory 13 are from previous data patterns is to be found at column 5, lines 41-65. There, Kim discloses that coefficients stored at 13b-13n are derived by utilizing the coefficient from initial coefficient location 13a "... as an initial filtering value when a certain channel is firstly selected and then obtains a filtering coefficient converging on the corresponding channel according to the inputted coefficient." (emphasis added).

Accordingly, with respect to claim 1, Kim Figure 6 teaches a control means 8, 9, 9a and 11 for controlling filtering properties of first filter means 4 and second filter means 6, wherein the control means 8, 9, 9a and 11 controls filtering properties of the first filter means 4 based on previous data patterns in the input signal received by the first filter means (the input signal underlined, above). With respect to claim 11, Kim Figure 6 teaches selection logic unit 8, 9, 9a and 11 connected to first finite impulse response filter unit 4 and second finite impulse response filter unit 6, wherein the selection logic unit controls the first finite impulse response filter unit 4 and the second finite impulse response filter 6

Appeal No. 2000-0720
Application No. 08/648,849

based on digital data $\bar{1}k$ output from the symbol detector 7 compared to data patterns output by the symbol detector in response to the data signals previously received by the decision feedback equalizer (the data patterns of the input signal and the channel selection underlined above).

Whereas claims 2, 3 and 5-10 depend from claim 1 and are not separately argued, we will sustain the rejection of these dependent claims.

Whereas claims 13-17 depend from claim 11 and are not separately argued, we will sustain the rejection of these dependent claims.

We will not sustain the rejection of claim 24, and claim 25 which depends therefrom, because there is no disclosure in Kim of a plurality of sets of coefficients or control means for selecting a set of coefficients. Kim only teaches a set of coefficients in memory 13 of Figure 4.

Summary

In summary:

a) the decision of the examiner to reject claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fisher is reversed.

Appeal No. 2000-0720
Application No. 08/648,849

b) the decision of the examiner to reject claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-17, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kim is affirmed as to claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-17, and is reversed as to claims 24 and 25.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 CFR § 1.136(a).

AFFIRMED-IN-PART

Appeal No. 2000-0720
Application No. 08/648,849

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------|
| STANLEY M. URYNOWICZ JR. |) | |
| Administrative Patent Judge |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| JOSEPH L. DIXON |) | BOARD OF PATENT |
| Administrative Patent Judge |) | APPEALS AND |
| |) | INTERFERENCES |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP |) | |
| Administrative Patent Judge |) | |

SU/RWK

LSI LOGIC CORPORATION
1551 MCCARTHY BLVD. MS D-206
PATENT LAW DEPT.
MILPITAS, CA 95035